

From: [Garyg Miller](#)
To: [Barbara Nann](#); [Dipanjana Bhattacharya](#); [Kevin Shade](#); [Susan Roddy](#)
Cc: [Carlos Sanchez](#)
Subject: Fw: Gulfco deficiency letter
Date: 06/10/2010 02:58 PM

FYI

Gary Miller, P.E.
Remediation Project Manager
EPA Region 6 - Superfund (6SF-RA)
(214) 665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

----- Forwarded by Garyg Miller/R6/USEPA/US on 06/10/2010 02:57 PM -----

From: "Morriss, Jim" <James.Morriss@tklaw.com>
To: Barbara Nann/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, "bill.mahley@strasburger.com" <bill.mahley@strasburger.com>
Cc: "allenbdaniels@gmail.com" <allenbdaniels@gmail.com>, "eric.pastor@pbwllc.com" <eric.pastor@pbwllc.com>, Garyg Miller/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, "Ray_Merrell@sequa.com" <Ray_Merrell@sequa.com>, "Tom.Mariani@usdoj.gov" <Tom.Mariani@usdoj.gov>, "sslowey@rohmmaas.com" <sslowey@rohmmaas.com>, "DBelote@dow.com" <DBelote@dow.com>
Date: 06/10/2010 02:27 PM
Subject: Re: Gulfco deficiency letter

Thank you Barbara. After reviewing your e-mail, I want to be sure there is no misunderstanding as to the position of the Participating Parties. We have consistently communicated our intention to comply with the UAO while asking for an extension in a deadline established by EPA in order to allow EPA to consider and respond to an alternative to further BERA work. We have stated that this alternative of a sediment removal action and a more expedited completion is at risk absent an extension. Without the extension the parties will be compelled to continue to expend time and money on the BERA, a path inconsistent with the expedited removal alternative being considered by EPA. Please contact either Bill Mahley or me should you have any questions.

Regards,
Jim Morriss

From: Nann.Barbara@epamail.epa.gov <Nann.Barbara@epamail.epa.gov>
To: Mahley, Bill <Bill.Mahley@strasburger.com>
Cc: allenbdaniels@gmail.com <allenbdaniels@gmail.com>; DBelote@dow.com <DBelote@dow.com>; Eric Pastor <eric.pastor@pbwllc.com>; Miller.Garyg@epamail.epa.gov <Miller.Garyg@epamail.epa.gov>; Morriss, Jim; Merrell, Ray <Ray_Merrell@sequa.com>; tom.mariani@usdoj.gov <tom.mariani@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Thu Jun 10 07:59:39 2010
Subject: Re: Gulfco deficiency letter



9543109

Thank you for your email clarification. Walking away from the May 17 meeting, my client did not come away with an understanding that the PRP Group was not willing to expend money to comply with the UAO while EPA explored the ecorremoval option with you. At the meeting, I stated that EPA would not suspend or grant extensions for the UAO while any discussion took place. Given that you are asking the agency to revisit this issue, I will speak with my client and get back with you.

Barbara A. Nann
Assistant Regional Counsel
EPA Region 6 (6RC-S)
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75202
phone: (214) 665-2157
fax: (214) 665-6460
nann.barbara@epa.gov

Gulfco deficiency letter

Mahley, Bill

to: Barbara Nann

06/09/2010 03:52 PM

Cc: Garyg Miller, tom.mariani, "Eric Pastor", "Morriss, Jim", allenbdaniels, "Merrell, Ray", DBelote

Barbara,

The attached letter is most disappointing.

The Gulfco PRP Group has not missed a single deadline since the Unilateral Administrative Order was issued in 2006. On the other hand, there have been numerous delays by the Agency in reviewing items submitted by the PRP Group under the UAO that have contributed to the duration of this project.

With regard to the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment, the Group has made a reasoned, cogent and compelling proposal to streamline the RI/FS process by conducting a wetlands sediment removal process in lieu of further ecological study and work on the BERA. The approach would allow the parties to get to a remedy which all seem to agree the data collected at the Site clearly supports.

The Group, and others retained to assist the Group in this process, travelled to Dallas on May 17 to present and explain the approach and answer all questions posed by the Agency. We clearly expressed the Group's preference for the approach presented. We also said that the Group was prepared to complete the RI/FS process under the UAO if the Agency rejected the proposal. Finally, we clearly stated that we were not willing to expend the time, effort and money to follow both paths simultaneously, and we asked the Agency to suspend any outstanding BERA issues until the Agency decided whether to proceed with the Group's proposal.

The Agency promised us a response the following week. The week of May 24 came and went with no response. The week of May 31 came and went with no response. Then yesterday our project engineer received the attached deficiency letter (although it is dated June 1, it was not delivered until June 8). The letter advises Mr. Pastor that the BERA we submitted in May 10 was deficient, and that we have 14 days to correct the deficiencies the Agency believes exist in the May 10 submission.

Today Jim Morriss and I asked for a call with you and Tom Mariani to discuss this letter and the threat to seek civil penalties of \$37,500 per day. Tom was apparently unavailable. The three of us spoke, however, and Jim and I made it clear that our clients can and will spend the effort and money (estimated at \$35,000, plus Dow and Chromalloy's internal time) to address the Agency's BERA comments, but at the risk the Group will be forced to withdraw its removal action proposal. We once again requested a brief suspension of this deadline to allow the Agency to consider and respond to the Group's proposal, and for the Group to address any issues raised by the Agency's response. The suspension is justified by the fact that the two approaches are mutually inconsistent. Additional funds expended to perfect the BERA work plans will be wasted if the parties select the expedited approach. Further, this is an insignificant delay in the overall picture, and is entirely within EPA's authority to grant.

We ask that the deficiently letter be withdrawn, and that the deadline to address concerns with the Group's May 10 BERA submission be suspended pending the decision on the wetlands sediment removal alternative.

Best regards,
Bill Mahley

This email message and any attachments are confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify Strasburger & Price, LLP immediately -- by replying to this message or by sending an email to postmaster@strasburger.com -- and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you.

[attachment

"Document.pdf" deleted by Barbara Nann/R6/USEPA/US]